REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The non-final Office Action of October 26, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 7, 9, 18, 29, 31, and 40 have been amended. Claims 98-102 have been added. Claims 1-2, 4-20, 22-24, 26-42, 44-51, 53, 68-70, and 98-102 remain pending in this application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 1-2, 4-20, 22-24, 26-42, 44-51, and 53 are allowed. Minor amendments to claims 7, 9, 18, 29, 31, and 40 have been made to present the claims in a more preferred form. Claims 98-102 have been added. Support for these claims is found throughout the original written description and drawings. New claims 98-102 are all dependent upon claims specified as being allowable. As no new matter is added with these new claims, the new claims are allowable at least for the same reasons as their base claim.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 68-70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Basilico (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,360, hereinafter referred to as *Basilico*) in view of Carmi (U.S. Patent No. 5,311,593, hereinafter referred to as *Carmi*). Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

To establish prima facie obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all claim limitations. MPEP § 2143. Even if combined, the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claim 68. Claim 68 recites, among other features, "the network address is used to route data packets over the network and is generated using an algorithm that selects the network address quasi-randomly from a plurality of network addresses that are each mapped to the receiving computer." The Office Action states that figures 1 and 5B and column 5, lines 15-36 of *Basilico* teach this claim limitation. However, the Office Action misapprehends what the cited lines of *Basilico* teach.

Column 5, lines 15-36 of *Basilico* does not teach this limitation. Instead, the *Carmi* system teaches a predefined manner for selecting a routing header, where the packet header is selected by going down a fixed, predefined list in a particular unalterable order. A first particular

switch destination port is identified. A test is made to determine whether the destination port has unique output routing, such as whether it is busy. If busy, the next port on the list becomes the destination port. (See *Basilico*, col. 3, lines 24-28, lines 40-53, and col. 6, lines 1-32). As such, under the *Basilico* system, the header packet is not generated using an algorithm that selects the network address quasi-randomly from a plurality of network addresses that are each mapped to the receiving computer. In addition, combining the *Carmi* reference with *Basilico* does not contribute any additional information that would cure the deficiencies of *Basilico*.

Further, the Action states that "Basilico does not show[s] the network address for *extraction by the receiving computer.*" (Action, page 3). To cure this deficiency of *Basilico*, the Action relies on *Carmi*, stating that "this feature is well known in the art." Specifically, the Action cites the abstract and column 5, line 64 to column 6, line 9 as describing this feature of Applicants' independent claim 68. However, the Office Action misapprehends what the cited lines of *Carmi* teach.

Column 5, line 64 to column 6, line 9 of *Carmi* does not teach "a network address for extraction by the receiving computer." Instead, the *Carmi* system teaches a security entity that monitors data packets coming into a port of a network to determine whether to cypher/decypher a portion of the data packet depending on whether destination/source addresses match an affiliated port address. (*Carmi*, Abstract). Neither the cited portion of *Carmi*, nor any other portion, teaches or suggests extraction of any portion of data packets. Specifically, the security entity 9 cyphers the data portion of the data packet when a match of the addresses is not made. (Col. 6, lines 1-5). As such, *Carmi* fails to cure the admitted deficiencies of *Basilico*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Dependent claims 69 and 70 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their base claim 68.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below. No fee is believed due, however, if any fees are required or if an overpayment has been made the Commissioner is authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 13 day of January, 2005   By: _____

Ross Dannenberg, Registration No. 49,024

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001